

REMARKS

This application has been reconsidered carefully in light of the final Office Action dated as mailed on 07 July 2006. A careful reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

No additional claim fee is believed due as a result of this Amendment because neither the total number of pending claims nor the number of pending independent claims exceeds the total number and the number of independent claims, respectively, for which fees have previously been paid.

Amendment to the Claims

By the above, claims 32, 43 and 54 have been amended to more fully and completely claim the disclosed subject matter. Claim 48 has been canceled in view of amended Claim 43.

Claim 32 additionally requires that the chamber opener includes a throttling orifice formed therein, and that the second chamber contents enter the diffuser chamber through the throttling orifice. Amended claim 32 finds support, for example, in FIG. 1, and in the specification at page 24, last paragraph (continuing onto page 25).

Serial No.: 10/669,884

Claim 43 additionally requires that the at least one gas treatment element comprises a filter composed of a woven metal. Amended claim 43 finds support in the specification at page 18, last paragraph.

Claim 54 additionally requires that upon actuation of the inflation assembly, a portion of the first reaction products pass through the gas treatment element to contact and move the chamber opener to open the second chamber. Amended claim 54 finds support in the specification in FIG. 1 and at page 24, last paragraph (continuing onto page 25).

Claims 32-47 and 49-62 remain in the application. No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of Claims 43-44, 48-50, 54 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Yamazaki et al., U.S. Patent 6,908,105, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claim 43 to recite that the at least one gas treatment element comprises a filter composed of a woven metal. The '105 Patent discloses an annular supporting member 35 with gas flow holes 63 therein. As clearly seen in the figures, the annular supporting member 35 is not a woven metal filter, as

Serial No.: 10/669,884

in Applicants' claimed invention. The '105 Patent does not anticipate amended claim 43, as the '105 Patent does not teach or suggest Applicants' recited woven metal filter.

Applicants have amended claim 54 to recite that upon actuation of the inflation assembly, a portion of the first reaction products pass through the gas treatment element to contact and move the chamber opener to open the second chamber. Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, in the '105 Patent, the products from the igniter 26 do not pass through the annular supporting member 35 before contacting the ball-like rupturing means 34. Therefore, the '105 Patent does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention.

Claims 44, 48-50 and 59 depend from claims 43 and 54, respectively, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 43 and 54.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 32-37, 39-42, 45-47, 52, 53, 55-57 and 60-62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., U.S. Patent 6,908,105, in view of Moore et al., U.S. Patent 6,244,623, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite that the chamber opener includes a throttling orifice formed therein, and that the at least a portion of the second

Serial No.: 10/669,884

chamber contents enter the diffuser chamber through the throttling orifice. Neither the '105 Patent nor the '623 Patent, alone or in combination, discloses a moveable chamber opener with an orifice formed therein through which stored gas passes. The prior art combination does not provide each and every claim limitation, and thus the *prima facie* case of obviousness can not be maintained.

Each of claims 33-37, 39-42, 45-47, 52, 53, 55-57 and 60-62 depends from one of amended claims 32, 43 and 54, and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 32, 43 and 54, respectively.

The rejection of claims 51 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., U.S. Patent 6,908,105, in view of Haland et al., U.S. Patent 5,788,270, is respectfully traversed. Claims 51 and 58 depend from one of amended claims 43 and 54, respectively, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 43 and 54.

The rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., U.S. Patent 6,908,105, in view of Moore et al., U.S. Patent 6,244,623, and further in view of Haland et al., U.S. Patent 5,788,270, is

Serial No.: 10/669,884

respectfully traversed. Claim 38 depends from amended claims 32, and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 38.

Conclusion

In view of the above, all pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is solicited. However, should the Examiner detect any remaining issue or have any question, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned, preferably by telephone, in an effort to expedite examination of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick C. Kottis

Registration No. 31,974

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road; Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
TEL (847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403